

Sunday, March 05, 2000, 9:12 AM

\draft\titles-themes\titles

Franz Jägerstetter (d. Aug. 9, 1943)

[(Austrian draft resister): "This train is going to hell."]

Train to Hell

Road to Hell

[is paved with good intentions! See the "good intentions" of the "honorable men" (Colby);

We undertook Vietnam for the noblest motives, noble cause (Westmoreland, Carter? Reagan;) altruistic motives; some truth to this, as in Kosovo, other "humanitarian interventions" (Humanitarian bombing); Hypothesis: most mass killing is done with good intentions, and good conscience; it is believed to be justified (even obligatory) by those directing it and those executing it; or at least the latter feel justified and obligated to obey orders (see dialog before Agincourt, in Henry V: But if the war be not just...)

(This may be less commonly true of individual killing, non-directed/ordered, non-organized); the focus on these as the arena of moral choice, of problematic killing, of evil action, is misleading as to the motives of and physical and moral dangers of

One must challenge, resist, disavow, disobey — not only
the orders of one's superiors (as per of death, in the military in war)
but the rationale, their "good motives," which they sincerely believe
(even if, self-serving, conforming, unthinking, unethically, unquestioning)
mass killing, both of military and of non-combatants, the moral

problems raised by the latter and the challenge to resistance.)

Question Authority — not only what they order + say, but what they
believe, value, and tell you to believe + value.
Getting Off the Train to Hell

...the Killing Train. (Michael Albert?)

Is This the Road to Hell?

What is the way to Hell? (There is no way to Hell. Hell is the way).
Which way to Hell? Which is the way to Hell?

[Why does it take 50 million sperm to find one egg? Because
they won't ask directions.]

The light at the end...
is hell (fire)

Daddy, Are We Lost? (Shut up, I explained. Ring Lardner.)

Directions From Hell

Leaving Hell

Escaping from Hell.

Blocking the ^{Tracks} (Road) to Hell

The Gates of Hell (Storming the Gates of Hell)

Slipwalking to Hell.

Racing to Hell

(Yunk. Race to Oblivion)

Blowing the Bridge to Hell

[See Clinton's: Bridges to the 21st Century)

[See Hemingway's Robert Jordan: waiting, dying, to blow up a
bridge to be crossed by fascists.]

[See Sartre's Mathieu: praying to hold on, firing, to slow
the Nazi advance for just fifteen minutes.]

[Horatious at the bridge: confronting the Tuscan army, alone,
to stop their advance on the bridge, long enough for the bridge to
Rome to be collapsed. A poem that inspired Liddy, as well as me.]

[Thermopylae: Go, stranger, and tell the Lacedaemonians, that
we lie here, obedient to their laws.]

Go tell it to the Spartans (early movie about Vietnam, with
Burt Lancaster)

Howman:

[...The Spartans on the sea-wet rocks sat down and combed
their hair. (My image of the preparations of those, on May 1,
1971, preparing to sit down in the streets of Washington.)

(formerly, an image for a Marine: who revered the story of Captain
Barber's stand at Fox Hill, 1950, guarding the withdrawal route of
the First and Fifth Marines; one commanded by Chesty Puller:

"...They can't all get away this time. " " *O.D. Suck?*
Retreat, hell; we're
advancing in another direction."

Advancing in Another Direction

Retreat from Hell

Break-out from Hell

Freezing Hell

[My draft speech for July 1965: how long will we persist in our aims and effort in Vietnam? "Till hell freezes over."

(Edward Ellsberg's book: Hell on Ice.)

(Notion: Bringing ice-cubes to hell. Bringing Ice to Hell)

["Then it was as if an ax had split my head, and my heart broke open. But what had really happened was that my life had split in two. ^I~~We~~ thought, we are eating our young, devouring them, using them....in Vietnam, and on the barricades at home."

[William Bundy, on why Nixon wouldn't pursue any more Cambodias: "The kids won't let him."]

A Split Life

Life Split in Two

Ax to the Head

My Heart Broke Open

Eating Our Young.

[Observer flying over Hiroshima (^{Robert} Sherwood?): "We are cannibals."]

(Not, mainly suicide: to see this as a choice defines either desperation or depression / (wonders))
TO KILL OR NOT TO KILL — TO (LET THEM) BE; OR NOT TO (LET THEM) BE

[The human problem (see my notes on the back of Delbanco's

"The Death of Satan"): our species lacks an instinctive

OPTION

inhibitions against killing our own, against killing other human

Something to be ordered, not obeyed: or not.

animals. (Killing other humans is, rather, a "choice" for us, a

"evil"

matter of "free will," a matter for calculation of costs and

benefits and comparison of alternative courses of actions and

desired outcomes. This is also true of mass killing, massacre of

civilians; and of "use" (sic) of nuclear weapons, omnicide, the

destruction of nations (see interchange on instructions for

Seaborn by Lodge, May 1965) (despite General Butler's point in

the recent Bulletin of Atomic Scientists that no should have the

right or the capability, nor should contemplate, to destroy a

nation: hence need to abolish nuclear weapons).

See Herman Kahn: ...to kill 100 million people without

"compulsive" thinking is always wrong.

Himmler: ...our triumph [that we have remained decent; see

Townsend Hoopes, on "best and brightest," and on LBJ: though

"volatile" (what was he referring to? What did he know?), "not an

evil man, like Hitler." (Look hard at the choices he actually

your:
≥ 100

RBE's bands:

I wish to eliminate certain "options"
FU (2nd un?); Torture; massacre

made, the "costs" and the benefits pursued, including likelihood
of achieving them or of suffering the outcomes he feared if he
didn't bomb). (How different were his subordinates from Eichmann-

HAK:
Smith
Gibson

-see recent publication of his diary--or Speer?) Is this a very detailed,
explicit, unfair comparison? (McG, McN, Ballou)

Another way of defining the human problem: the lack [or
unreliability] of ^{or, to put it positively, helpfully,} [the need to achieve]: an inclusive enough
concern for other humans, beyond family and tribe, beyond
organization and nation: a recognition of family-hood, or species-

hood, which would at the least strongly inhibit killing. (That is
a limited, but perhaps crucial, meaning of "love," as in "Love
they neighbor as thyself"; or "All we need is love" or "We must
love one another or die." A concern--based on (but not identical
with, perhaps!) recognition of common nature, common
family/species ("we are all brothers and sisters, cousins")--a
consideration for other's feelings and right to life. (Ha! Major
political issue of the day in US: does this extend to all fetuses,
or to none, or to some?) (See new book on longevity of practice
of infanticide, among other animals and among humans).

How
"Have some
concern for
the neighbor"

[See ethical vegetarians, who extend this to other or all
animals.]

cap. punishment
Do something/
crimes have "a
right to life"?
Animal
"endemic"?

[See Delbanco, Death of Satan, p. 194: Faust wants
Mephistopheles to "clear out an old couple whose cottage stands on
a spot that he, Faust, covets as a building site: That aged

Do not
be willing
to much
(or eat)
(What of
animal,
threatening
"neighbor"?
(Breathe
on NUN)

couple should have yielded/ I want their lindens in my grip,/ Since these few trees that are denied me/ Undo my worldwide ownership/...hence is our soul upon the rack,/ To feel, amid plenty, what we lack." [First Noble Truth]

Faust is loudly indignant when he learns that Mephisto^{phelcs} having taken his wishes seriously, has killed the old couple and burned their house to the ground. But the offense, we suspect, is not the deed so much as the tactless fact of his being told about it. He wants not so much that the old man and woman should have been spared as not to know what was done with them." (p. 194)

(guin that it was done. Does he really prefer it done?)

[Note that I perceived Faust's motives in myself in trying to kill the inhabitant (creator) of the conch shell I wanted for an ornament and souvenir. It was resisting my wishes, my will; struggling to stay alive and to live in the house it had built. This little, impudent rebel, defying me (though I didn't get angry...). And my sudden recognition: By what right was I killing it, taking its home? For what? To meet what urgent necessity, obligation? (In what crisis, for me?) (Did this create a crisis for me? A crise de conscience? A moral crisis? A sense of choice, responsibility: one path leading to hell?)

[Last night, someone supposed that it was misleading or mistaken to say--like Hersh, yesterday--that I had made a "moral choice," that my story was how I came to make a "moral decision."

↓ that not

Her supposition was that I had, over a period of time, changed, become a person who "had to do what I did," who "could no longer" act in a previous way (no longer wanted? "could not?").

[See my notation in my notebook on September 23d, 1969, a week away from copying the Pentagon Papers, at the seminar on Ecology and Nonviolence at the Institute for the Study of Nonviolence, led by Burt Wallrich): "I am changing. How did this begin?"]

§ But: that's not the way it felt, with copying the PP. That always felt like a choice; a tactical choice; not something I "had to do, I had no choice, something that had to be done." (It didn't ^{seem} likely enough to contribute to stopping the war under Nixon, to be compelling in that way). It often didn't look like the best use of my time at the moment, even when the situation was most urgent. I postponed, put it aside, left it incomplete for periods: not primarily for reasons of risk. (Though certain decisions reflected consideration of risk). *When I turned back to doing*

it, it intended, it was not so much because of new circumstances that made it look more effective or appropriate, but because " " intended my full But for that matter, it was not the copying and releasing of the

Pentagon Papers that was most consequential: though it supported the impact of what was consequential, just as I'd hoped it would support other actions that I expected to be more relevant: testimony in hearings by former officials, questioning of current officials, a sense in the public that what I was claiming was the

*vibrating
examples of
devotion,
sacrifice
(min 8:4*

see Jim Forest quoting Thomas Merton, in Orbis book "The Path to Peace"

** Gary Klint, Butch Cassidy: men who live their lives as ^(mission) free men even if it costs their lives*

current policy might be true, because it would be in the pattern of the past as revealed in the PP (that didn't happen as much as I hoped!). In fact, none of these particular things happened! No hearings. And no significant stimulation to the antiwar movement, no particular use by the surviving antiwar movement (which was running down sharply, and was only a remnant already in mid-1971) of the Pentagon Papers one way or another. Some effect on stimulating imitation, but on the whole this was smothered.

(*Secret bombing of Cambodia + ~~NVA~~ NVA; tilt to Pakistan*)
(Disclosure of drugs and corruption by Embassy counsel...).

(Major exceptions: whatever impact my disclosure had on: revelation of Cambodian bombing; earlier, revelation of bombing of North Vietnam (Lavelle); disclosure of tilt to Pakistan (did it help Anderson induce Radford (?) to give him documents? He said so. CHECK) However, without the ^{*revelation of ND*} publication of the PP, Nixon's knowledge that I had copied NSSM-1 and given it to Mathias (as I had given the Wheeler Report to Bobby Kennedy; and later gave the JFK cables on Diem to Church and to Ted Kennedy, not to Hersh) would not have worried him so.

Nevertheless, unforeseen by me (I started to say, unforeseeably, but that's not so true, if I had thought about it; see the implication that NSSM-1 gave of "a source within the Nixon White House"; and my lawyers' sense that it was much more legally dangerous; but even that focused on the danger for me, not the impact on Nixon, or even the public): the "door that opened when I pushed on it" (impossible to predict, when you push on many doors)

was the copying of NSSM-1 and giving it to (a Republican Senator:

almost pure happenstance) Mathias. (His readiness to be the
but it was to a Republican - who was most likely to tell

Republican man on the white horse was admirable--and
consequential--but its ^{actual} effect depended also on his cowardice in
the end, his fear of being given the Goodell treatment if he were
silent about it and then was found out, if he was not cooperative
(otherwise, how would they have known he had it? I might have
told...).

David?

Mitchell on June 13

Can the
other hand:

a Dan
would have
addressed it

publishing!
(better?)

As I said to Wendy in a note with my manuscript on the
breakfast meeting with HAK that led to NSSM-1: Without this
meeting, without my working on NSSM-1 and subsequently copying it
and giving it to Mathias--i.e., had I only copied the PP--Nixon
would have stayed in office till the end of his term, and US
bombing of NVN would have resumed in April, 1973 and persisted for
at least 2 more years, more probably at least 3-1/2 more years
(till the end of his term) and quite possibly years longer.

calculation doesn't
take you far.

(cf. RT. I reacted as if: a small chance (the end one) of
"coming out even, avoiding a sure loss" outweighed a larger

A moral: You can't tell which action will actually prove
consequential, or most consequential (in a desirable direction, or
in the way you want, or at all, even for bad). A decision (my

chance of
a longer loss...
inevitable

decision) to be ready and willing to do everything I could--non-
violent and truthful--that might help, with little or no regard
for the costs to me. (Thus, I considered everything that might
help; my choice of which to try at a particular point or in what
sequence did reflect my best calculations of costs--in effort,

O, I

(at whatever
cost to

myself --

not, "to kill
the turkey"

but... to help
end the war!

see Forest/Merton

March '68;

Aug 69

Oct 1, 69

attention, ability to do other things--and benefits: but without much attention, the usual concern, for costs to my career or my standing in the Establishment (thus, even, "loss of effectiveness, credibility, access" as an Insider: the usual rationale, with some substance, for rejecting acts that would destroy that status, "aside" from its effects on income and prestige and comfort; i.e. for rejecting revelations, with documents, that would be seen as "betrayal of trust" of important Insiders). So, one must still calculate; but don't limit yourself to what you judge to be "the" most effective action, even where others involve risk: try many doors, many avenues. (Watch out for traffic: but cross streets!)

*looks like
"not calculating"*

*usually some that involve high risk, little
promise of success (not all of them, esp. early on, or your efforts
to reflect wait last long)**

Waking the Sleepers

lifetime uncertainty

(some, not too many, long shots)

Asleep at the Wheel

even, costs more

Silence of the Lambs (Clarisse tried to save one lamb from slaughter (after she learned what happened to the lambs; note what happens today to young lambs, veal); as a child, she failed. She wanted this time to save one victim from a serial murderer. I wanted to avert the next million tons of bombs (as dropped under Clifford and Warnke and Halperin and Gelb, in 1968!) (How many Vietnamese civilians died that year? How many Americans? While these well-intentioned people deferred to LBJ's authority--like Humphrey--in their efforts to end the war!)

** I was wrong to put off "PP" (major revelation of docs) till 1969-71,
(not 1961, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968).*

(1966, no - not much opportunity or incentive, demand of effort)

But I was not wrong to try other things first, i left Oct 69!

(But virtually no one did what they could to avert Nixon's victory over Humphrey, starting with Humphrey himself; but in that case, almost no one was aware that it made much difference, in Vietnam. could they have? (How widely known was that part of the Miami Herald revelation of his speech to the Southern delegates in August? Note that most of the new people Nixon did reveal his secret strategy to, accepted his judgment that it would (or could) work, quickly. Those who would have challenged this, weren't told by him. (Note that even Mort, in his chapter on "What Nixon Learned from Vietnam" in Lake's book, describing the talk to the delegates, nevertheless denies what he believed in 1969: that Nixon's threats in 1969 involved nuclear threats. When did he write that? And why did he deny that? (Probably for credibility...but he could have just been silent on the point.)

*His memory now, wrong, is
that he did not deny, he
revealed it then. (June 2000)
(Tell him)*

Decent Folk

The Crimes of Decent Folk (People) (Men)

of Honorable Men

*(Bunker / more Bunkers)
Colley*

*MHH *
I did
not!

c.r.
MHH,
me!*

[Delbanco: evil as "willed insouciance." Insouciance as "lighthearted unconcern" (not this; a rather positive, playful, pleasant state); nonchalance--cool indifference

[Merriam Webster: nonchalant (from OF, to disregard, from non - chaloir, to concern, from L calere to be warm): "having an air of easy unconcern or indifference [often, to one's own danger or discomfort? Free of anxiety, worries?]

Insouciance: from F, in + soucier, to trouble, disturb): lighthearted unconcern.

Webster's Universal: insouciant: free from concern, worry, or anxiety [not? Free from a sense of responsibility, for past or current or future happenings? Responsibility for changing them, protecting others?] carefree (good! Free from care...) (not, usually meant: free from care for others; but free from worry about oneself).

Nonchalant: coolly unconcerned; indifferent or unexcited.

Nonchalance: cool indifference or lack of concern; casualness.

(Again, this seems usually to refer to concern about oneself, danger to oneself, possible cost to oneself; an enviable or admirable quality; neither dictionary associates it with unconcern about others (though one could specify that).)

TV document 2000
"Meaning": Psychologist: "Evil is lack of
empathy." (f: selection; (ordered, directed, authorized...
maintained, ideologically,
socially; socially constructed...
(total)

Say: Evil as willed (chosen), indifference, unconcern, (In
about other.
circumstances where there is great danger to others, of suffering
or loss of lives, that might be imposed by or averted by one's own
choices of behavior and expression; unconcern about such
consequences or potential consequences to others, unconcern about
or lack of consideration to their feelings, dignity (see slavery)
suffering, survival.) Hence, use of them solely as means,
feeling free to destroy/eliminate/torture them.

[The word "solely" is important here; and
"destroy/eliminate/torture/kill." Surely everyone "uses" other
people, uses them "in part" as means, prefers others' interest--
including one's own, or one's family or team--over theirs, part of
the time (or much of the time). And one does not, need not,
should not, always feel guilty or even regretful about that,
defensive or apologetic, justly accused of "evil" or sin.

But to kill: to eliminate them totally and irreversibly, to
will and accomplish the ending/shortening of their life (when they
are not close to death by "natural causes," or suffering in a way
that causes them to desire death...). (and see: foetus; severely
disabled infant (Peter Singer: less than 28 days, or one year; not
yet aware of itself as a separate being, with past and future [why
is that so morally relevant? Isn't the the issue, ability to feel pain, as

with animals (issue of vegetarianism: Singer is veg. (vegan?) See Princeton Alumni Journal)

Chattel slave: "right" to kill, whip, torture. (See corporal punishment issue, in Britain and US: last week's NYT. Right to beat children, school-boys... (girls?) See ambivalence of those beaten in school toward "masters" who beat them, and toward beating. Fact of having "survived" and "endured" it (bravely; in a way that maintains or enhances the respect of others, and of the beater, and of one's self; like boot camp, initiation--see Skull and Bones, George W. Bush--(youth, childhood!), a life-threatening illness ("he fought a brave battle against cancer"), combat (also, bonding; suffering together, bravely, being reliable and being able to rely on others to support and "cover" you, even when it endangers them or calls for great alertness: noticing threats, where fire is coming from, staying awake on watch).

But also: identification with aggressor. The beaten spouse or child, or sexually abused child. The association of parental love, dependence, with pain and abuse. The exhilaration of discovering not only that you can survive pain or beating, not only with some dignity and self-respect (Hitler would count the blows he got from his step-father with a rhinoceros-hide whip), but with the respect and love (and continued sense of "guardianship," responsibility for welfare) in one's parent/beater. (Like Skull and Bones, the effect of forced

"confession"--e.g. of sexual history--to the group (like communist self-criticism sessions, and Oneida, other intentional communities): the discovery that one is still accepted, valued, "loved," despite/after revelation of one's nature and sins.) You are a bad enough person, or have behaved badly enough, (at least in their eyes, or perhaps also in your own) as to deserve "six of the best," punishment; yet (especially if you "take it like a man") you can be respected and loved and cared for: by this person, who is evidently a good person, a forgiver, a good parent (who either "wants above all your own good, your good character and future"--even at the price of causing you pain now--or else, being human, "can't help himself" (his rage, his drunken furies, his reaction to defiance or frustration). "Better to be punished and forgiven, than to suffer cold indifference." (NYT). The wife who accepts or values her beatings, because afterwards the husband is loving, begs for forgiveness, promises...

Preparation: a childhood that makes this behavior familiar, even comforting (because it was accompanied with a modicum of reassurance, of dependability of care, of affection at times); and gives the "grown-up" a permanent sense that "this is the best you can get, the best to hope for, the best there (actually) is," in life, out there: intermittent love and care, interspersed with indifference, exploitation and cruelty: these associated in the one care-taker. The alcoholic or abusive parent, the parent who demands servility, who exploits...